4371.b.30 (1-9)

# A POSTSCRIPT TO THE *Charge of Heresy* CONTINUED.

Occasion'd by the

REPLY of *Joseph Middleton* to the Account of a Conference held with him.

WHEREIN

That Account is cleared from the Charge of Falshood; and the principal Answers in the REPLY are shown to be insufficient.

BEING THE

Third and Last Defence of *Water-Baptism.*

*By* HENRY STEBBING, M. *A.*

*They have chosen their own ways, and their soul delighteth in their abominations. I also will chuse their delusions, and will bring their fears upon them; because when I called, none did answer; when I spake, they did not hear: but they did evil before mine eyes, and chose that in which I delighted not.* Isaiah 66. 3, 4.

*A Man that is an Heretick, after the first and second admonition, reject.* Tit. 3. 10.

*LONDON:*

Printed for J. PEMBERTON, at the *Buck* and *Sun* against St. *Dunstan's* Church in *Fleetstreet.* MDCCXVI.

Price Six-Pence.

4371.b.30
1—9

BRITISH MUSEUM

# An ANSWER TO *Joseph Middleton*'s Vindication.

WHEN I had publiſhed my Reply to G. G.'s Anſwer to my Account of the Conference, &c. I was in hopes that I had thereby diſcharged my ſelf from all farther Trouble in Relation to that Controverſy. But I perceive I am call'd to it once more by another Anſwer to the aforeſaid Account, which has ſince been publiſhed by *J. M.* himſelf. Indeed I always look'd upon *J. M.* to be the propereſt Perſon to purſue the Diſpute againſt me; and could I have been aſſured that he would have done ſo, I had not cared how long I had waited his *Motions*. But a Year and more being paſſed ſince the Account of the Conference was made publick, and the Quakers having attempted a Vindication of themſelves by other Hands, I thought (as I reaſonably might) that this was all the Anſwer that was intended, and ſo without any farther Delay ſet my ſelf to the Writing of a Reply to it. And now tho' it has happened contrary to my Expectation, that *J. M.* has at laſt ventured upon the Management of his own Cauſe, I would

not have my Reader ſuppoſe that all that has been ſaid in my former Reply has been to no Purpoſe. For upon peruſing what *J. M.* has offer'd, it will appear that *G. G.* has been before-hand with him in ſome of his moſt plauſible Arguments; by which means a great Part of his Book ſtands, as I hope, already confuted. Beſides, I ſhall hereafter ſhew that *G. G.*'s Book ought probably to be eſteemed the Quakers Anſwer rather than *J. M.*'s; which if true, whatever it be in it ſelf, it deſerved the moſt diſtinct and particular Examination. But whether this be ſo or not, 'tis not now Material to enquire; the Book is anſwered; and if I am not grudged the Trouble of reading the Reply, it ſhall not repent me of the Pains I have taken in Writing it. And as to this of *J. M.* I think my ſelf obliged to take notice of it for theſe following Reaſons, *viz.* 1*ſt*, Becauſe he being the Perſon with whom the Debate was held, it may be expected that I ſhould. 2*dly*, Becauſe he has taken upon him to charge me with *Falſhood* and *Inſincerity*, in repreſenting the Conference; a Thing which *G. G.* and his Friends were ſo honeſt as not to pretend to. 3*dly*, Becauſe he has ſhewn ſome Inclination to give a direct Anſwer to thoſe Arguments which were then offered in Defence of Water Baptiſm, which likewiſe was not ſo much as attempted in the former Vindication. Upon theſe Accounts I hope the Reader will excuſe my giving him this new Trouble; which I ſhall endeavour to rid him of as ſoon as poſſible, having been ſo Particular before. And to ſay the Truth, the Caſe does not require that I ſhould be very Prolix. For ſetting aſide my Adverſary's abuſive Reflections, impertinent Digreſſions, together with ſuch Arguments as are already anſwered, and ſo deſerve no Notice; as alſo ſuch as for want of a competent Knowledge in his *Mother-Tongue*, and a little of that *Carnal Thing*, commonly called *good Senſe*, he has rendred all together unintelligible, and ſo are not capable of any: I ſay, ſetting aſide all theſe Things which have ſwelled *J. M.*'s Book to ſo large a Size, the Anſwer may be brought to ſo reaſonable a Compaſs, as may, I hope, ſatisfy my Reader without cloying him.

I be-

I begin with the Charge of *Falſhood*, which is Two-fold; *viz.* 1ſt, That I have omitted ſeveral of *J. M.*'s Arguments againſt me. *2dly*, That I have alſo omitted and miſrepreſented ſeveral of his Replies to my Arguments againſt him. Now as to the Firſt, the Reader is to take Notice, that the Chief of thoſe Arguments which I am charged with having omitted, are ſet down together under Five *Articles*, in a *Schedule* at the End of the Book, which is atteſted to by a Certificate ſubſcribed by Five Quakers.

The Title of the *Schedule* runs thus: *Some few of the Arguments and Anſwers, among more, ſpoken in the ſaid Conference, that are* TOTALLY *omitted in the* Prieſt's *Book of his* Amanuenſis's *Minutes, either thro' Deſign or Forgetfulneſs.*

I heartily wiſh for the Sake of theſe Men, that that ſame word *totally* had been left out; tho', to ſay the Truth, if it had, they would ſcarce have ſaved their Credit, as will be ſeen preſently. There is one Thing however which I will obſerve in their Favour, which is, That whereas *J. M.* charges me with downright *Knavery*, upon the Account of theſe Omiſſions, theſe Men are a little more moderate in their Cenſure, and ſeem willing to ſuppoſe they might have happened *thro' Forgetfulneſs*. This is a Piece of Charity not very uſual amongſt Quakers; and therefore I ſhould have thought my ſelf ſo much the more obliged to them for their Kindneſs, had I any Occaſion to make uſe of it; *i. e.* had I omitted any Thing which needed ſuch an Excuſe. But as it is, I can do no leſs than thank them for it; and as a Return I would, if I could, ſuppoſe that it was *thro' Forgetfulneſs*, or ſomething of that Kind, that they atteſted to theſe *Articles*. But this is hardly to be ſuppoſed; for pray obſerve,

I am charged with *totally* omitting, Imprimis, *My own Aſſertion*, viz. *That* Water Baptiſm *is an Ordinance of Chriſt, Eſſential to Salvation, as that without which none can be ſaved, yet not ſufficient of it ſelf without the Spirit's Aſſiſtance.* Now were I to be provoked to give any Perſon the Lie to his Face, ſurely I could never

never have a more juſtifiable Occaſion than this! My own Aſſertion, even that very Aſſertion which it was the Deſign of my whole Book to prove, omitted, and that totally! This is ſo groſs and palpable a Calumny, that it would be an Affront to the common Senſe of any Reader, but a Quaker, to go about to refute it. But ſince they are ſo very blind, that they muſt be led to every Thing as it were by the Noſe, I deſire them to look to my *Account*, p. 16. where they will find it the *Aſſumption* of my very firſt Syllogiſm, That *Chriſt has made Baptiſm with Water, the*, or (as I ought to have ſaid) a *Condition of Salvation*: Whence I inferr'd in my Concluſion, *that it is neceſſary to Salvation.* What think you? Is not this aſſerting that Water Baptiſm *is an Ordinance of Chriſt?* Is not this aſſerting that Water Baptiſm *is eſſential to Salvation?* And is not this aſſerting that *without* Water Baptiſm *none can be ſaved, i. e.* (as I would be always underſtood) according to the Conditions of the New Covenant? Surely it is. And how then did theſe Men dare to give it under their Hands, in ſo publick a Manner as this, That I have totally omitted this Aſſertion; unleſs they had a mind to proclaim their want of Shame, and demonſtrate to the whole World that they have no manner of Regard to what they ſay! But it is ſo far from being true that I have *totally* omitted the Aſſertion contained in the Firſt *Article*, that I have not omitted ſo much as one ſingle Part of it. For the only remaining Part of it is this; *viz. That* Water Baptiſm *is not ſufficient of it ſelf without the Spirit's Aſſiſtance.* Now tho' this is no where mentioned in my Book, together with the other, in one continued Sentence, as they have placed it, yet (what is abundantly ſufficient to my Juſtification) it is mentioned by it ſelf, and that very plainly. The Reader may ſatisfy himſelf of this (as *J. M.* and his Friends might, if they had pleaſed, before) by turning to *p.* 31. of my *Account*, where I have expreſly affirmed, *That no one can be a living Member of Chriſt's Church, who does not partake of the Gifts or Graces of his Holy Spirit.* A plainer Confeſſion than which, of the Inſufficiency

ency of Water Baptiſm without the Spirit's Aſſiſtance, cannot I think reaſonably be deſired.

The Third *Article* contains a Falſhood every whit as apparent as the former: For there I am charged with omitting this Argument of *J. M.'s, viz. That if Baptiſm with Water had been ſufficient for the very Apoſtles themſelves, then would there have been no Neceſſity of their being baptized with the Spirit. But there was a Neceſſity; therefore,* &c. But I ſhall deſire the Friends only to make uſe of their Eyes once more, and to turn to *Account*, p. 44. where they will find theſe Words; J. M. *in particular, ſtarted an Objection againſt* Water Baptiſm, viz. *That if the Apoſtles had look'd upon Baptiſm with Water to have been ſufficient without the Baptiſm of the* Holy Ghoſt, *how came it to paſs that ſo many were baptized with the Holy Ghoſt?* &c. And what is ſtill more wonderful, *J. M.* has repeated this very Queſtion in his Book, *p.* 58. together with my Anſwer to it! And is not this the very Argument almoſt *verbatim*, that I am here charged with having *totally* omitted? That Man muſt be inſuperably dull, who does not ſee it. Wherefore take notice, Friends, that henceforward we are to take nothing upon the Credit of your Teſtimonies. For by ſubſcribing to ſuch abominable Falſhoods as theſe, it plainly appears, either that you have ſubſcribed to you knew not what; or elſe that you are ready to ſet your Hands to any thing, tho' never ſo ſcandalous, which you think will be of any Service to your Cauſe.

The former Part of the Fourth *Article* is much of the ſame Stamp, only the Falſhood lies a little more concealed. There I am charged with *totally* omitting another of *J. M.*'s Arguments, *viz. As Water waſhed the outward Man, ſo doth the Spirit* (*i. e.* the Baptiſm of the Spirit, for this is what he means) *waſh the Souls and Conſciences of Men; the firſt being a Sign, the latter the Thing ſignified; the firſt aboliſhed by the Sufferings of Chriſt, who nail'd the Hand-writing of Ordinances to his Croſs; the latter then eſtabliſhed or inſtituted by him,* i. e. to be perpetual. This theſe Men are pleaſed to call one of *J. M.*'s Arguments, and ſo I ſuppoſe

poſe they will call every thing which *J. M.* ſaid. But certainly they could not be ſo blind, as not to ſee that this is no more than a good round *Aſſertion*, the Subſtance whereof is in ſhort this: *That* Water Baptiſm *was aboliſhed by the Sufferings of Chriſt, and the* Baptiſm with the Holy Ghoſt *appointed in its ſtead.* This therefore is *in effect*, that which I am here charged with having omitted; *i. e.* I am charged with having omitted that (not *Argument*, but) *Aſſertion* of *J. M.* which it was the whole Deſign of my Book to overthrow!

And thus it appears, that Three of theſe Five *Articles* are downright Falſhoods; they having charged me with the Omiſſion of Things, ſome whereof are ſet down *explicitly*, and *in terminis*; others are *in Subſtance*, and *virtually* contained in my Book. The Arguments mentioned in the Two remaining *Articles*, are not indeed to be met withal any where in my Narrative; but I think it will be very eaſy to clear my ſelf from the Imputation of Partiality upon that ſcore. In order whereto let it be remembred, That I did not undertake to give an Account of every thing which *J. M.* ſaid, (which indeed would ſcarce have been poſſible) but of *ſo much as was material and pertinent to the Points then debated, and to the Arguments which I made uſe of againſt him.* This was all I * promiſed, and I think all that I was obliged to; and *J. M.* ſeems to think ſo too: But hereupon he asks †, *Who is Judge what is material and pertinent?* To which he anſwers himſelf very ſmartly; *Truly, my Opponent makes himſelf Judge, who hath omitted under that Pretext, and ſet down, no doubt, what he thought beſt ſuited for him.* But you are under a great Miſtake, Sir; your Opponent does not, neither will he make himſelf the *only* Judge. He deſires, ſince you have given him ſo fair an Opportunity for it, that all the World may be made Judges, as well as he. See, here is your own Book wherein you have ſet down the

* *See* Account, *p.* 51, 52.

† Vindic. *p.* 10.

chief

chief at leaſt of thoſe Omiſſions, which you ſay I am chargeable with. Let theſe be examined, and if they proove material and pertinent, let me endure the Shame; but if not, I think no body can be at a loſs to know who is the Honeſt Man, you or I.

The Omiſſions are as follows, *viz.* 1. This Argument of J. M. *If the Church of Chriſt be a Spiritual Houſe to God, and the Members thereof lively Stones therein, then is there a Neceſſity of the Spirit's Baptiſm to make them ſuch. But*, &c. 2. J. M.'s *Proof that the Name ſignifies the Power and Virtue of Chriſt*, drawn from *John* 14. 26 and *Acts* 3. 6. 3. His *Proofs of Chriſt's Baptiſm with the Holy Ghoſt from* Mal. 3. 1, 2. *and* Mat. 3. 11. Theſe are the Arguments, and all the Arguments which I am particularly charged with having omitted; how material and pertinent they are, we are next to ſee. But I muſt firſt of all obſerve to you, that I have been before-hand with *J. M.* in charging my ſelf with one of theſe Omiſſions; and that is his Proof (as he calls it) that *the Name* ſignifies *the Virtue* and *Power* of Chriſt. I ſay, I have taken Notice of this Omiſſion in my *Account*, p. 40. where I have aſſigned this particular Reaſon for it; *viz. That whether to baptize in the Name ſignifies to baptize into the Power, or any Thing elſe, the Argument I then uſed would be the very ſame.* If the Reader will be pleaſed to examine that Argument, he will find this to be Truth; and then I hope he will think the Reaſon to be ſufficient: For this was plainly granting to *J. M.* his Point, for Argument's Sake; after which there could be no manner of Occaſion for me to obſerve particularly by what Way he went about to prove it. So that this Omiſſion being already ſhewn to be in no wiſe material, I ſhall take no further Notice of it, but proceed to the reſt.

Now that the Reader may judge whether theſe Arguments be material and pertinent or not, I ſhall conſider, 1*ſt*, What they are in themſelves; and, 2*dly*, What they are with Reſpect to thoſe particular Ends or Purpoſes, to which they were applied at the Conference. As to the Firſt, *viz.* The intrinſick Weight of theſe Argu-

ments, they are indeed very stout ones, highly worthy of so noble a Champion as *J. M.*! The Church is a *Spiritual House*, and therefore Men must be made Members thereof by a *Spiritual Baptism*, i. e. by the *Baptism with the Holy Ghost*. All this is as plain as can be; that is, if you will be so civil as to accept of *Sound* in the Room of *Sense*; for otherwise I think I may challenge any Man upon Earth to find out where the Force of it lies, unless he be such as *J. M.* and his Friends, who have abused their Understandings to that prodigious Degree, that they can see the Force of an Argument every where but where it is. Suppose I should say, that because the Church is an *outward* and *visible Society*, therefore Men must be made Members thereof by an *outward* and *visible Baptism*; i. e. by Water Baptism: How would *J. M.* answer me? How; why no doubt he would deny my Consequence. Very well! and so do I his; and let him prove it if he can. The Argument drawn from *Mal.* 3. 1, 2. is so very ridiculous that nothing can be more. The Prophet speaking of Christ, says, that he should be *like Refiners Fire*, and *like Fullers Soap*; i. e. that he should throughly purge or cleanse his Church. Well! And what then? Why therefore, I suppose, the Baptism with the Holy Ghost was to be perpetual! That is, if any Thing proves any Thing; for he might have quoted the first Verse in St. *Luke*'s Gospel, and it would have done every whit as well. The Text of St. *Matthew*, Chap. 3. ver. 11. is indeed somewhat more to the Purpose; but it proves neither the Baptism with the Holy Ghost to be perpetual, nor that Water Baptism is abolished. The *Baptist* says of himself, that he *baptized with Water*; but he does not say but that Christ was to baptize with Water too: He says that Christ should *baptize with the Holy Ghost*; but he no where says, that the Baptism with the Holy Ghost was to continue for ever.

I might have been a great deal more large in exposing the Folly and Weakness of these Arguments; but by the help of these short Hints I think they may be very safely trusted with the most ordinary Capacity. And the

Qua-

Quakers may (if they please) see, that if I have been faulty in omitting them, their Cause has suffer'd nothing by my Partiality. But for the further clearing my self from this Charge, let us consider, *2dly*, What these Arguments are, with Respect to those particular Ends or Purposes to which they were applied at the Conference, which indeed is by far the most material Enquiry. For to say the Truth, the bare *Insufficiency* of these Arguments was no good Reason why they should be omitted, because for the very same Reason, I might as well have omitted every Thing that *J. M.* said; which however would have been a Thing by no means justifiable. But then I think it must be said no on the other Hand, than were these Arguments a thousand times better than they really are, no Notice ought to have been taken of them at the Conference (and consequently that they ought not to have a Place in the *Account* of that Conference) provided they were urged at such Times, and upon such Occasions, as made them utterly *impertinent*, *i. e.* provided they had no manner of Connexion with, or relation to those Points which were debating, when these Arguments were propounded. For Instance, Suppose that when I was urging *Act.* i. 4, 5. *Chap.* 2. 1, 2, 3, 4. and *Vers.* 32, 33. suppose, I say, that whilst I was urging these Texts of Scripture to prove, that to be *baptiz'd* with the Holy Ghost, signifies to be endued with the Extraordinary or Miraculous Gift of the Holy Ghost, *J. M.* should have told me, that *the Church is a Spiritual House*; that *John baptized with Water*, and Christ *with the Holy Ghost*; and the like; 'tis evident at the very first Sight, that these, and such like Assertions, with all the Consequences that can rationally be inferred from them, would have been no Answer to my Argument, nor have had any Relation to it. Now this which I have here supposed was really the Case, as I perfectly well remember. When my first Argument was drawing towards a Conclusion, and he found that it began to pinch, then it was that he first began his Discourse about the *Spiritual House*. This instead of removing, was endeavouring to avoid the Difficulty, by running off

clearly to another Point: And therefore I immediately ſtopp'd him, telling him, that I would liſten to no Arguments which ſhould be ſo unfairly propoſed. After the ſame Manner, tho' I cannot ſay certainly at the ſame Time, were the other two Arguments thrown in upon me; which the Reader will be the more ready to believe, if he obſerves one Thing which is very obvious, *viz.* That *J. M.* has not mentioned any *Anſwers* given by me to theſe Arguments, or to that other before-mentioned. How happen'd this? Why, becauſe I never gave any. And why did I not anſwer thoſe Arguments? Becauſe they were alledged at ſuch Times, and upon ſuch Occaſions, as made it improper and abſurd for me to go about to anſwer them; *i. e.* when *J. M.* was to *anſwer* and not to *object*. I never refuſed a Reply to any of *J. M.*'s Arguments, which were ſeaſonably and pertinently offer'd, as thoſe have born, and will bear me Witneſs who were preſent at the Diſpute, and were competent Judges of the Matter; but as to thoſe which he was pleaſed to hale in, on purpoſe to perplex the Cauſe, and to avoid giving plain and direct Anſwers where he ought, I was ſo far from attempting to anſwer them, that I was reſolved not ſo much as to give them the hearing. *J. M.* knew this well enough, becauſe I told him ſo more than once; and therefore if he had thought theſe Arguments to be of any Importance, he ſhould have mentioned them when it came to be his Turn to uſe Arguments, and then they would have been ſet down along with the reſt. But this he never did, as the Reader may ſatisfy himſelf by turning to *Account*, p. 28. *&c. ſeq.* where he will find that when it was conſented to, that *J. M.* ſhould take upon him the Place of Opponent, he had recourſe to two Arguments of another Sort; and I dare venture my own Credit, and the Credit of my Friends, who have ſubſcribed to the Truth of this *Account*, againſt the Credit of *J. M.* and his Friends, if they ſhould dare to diſpute, whether there were any more Arguments beſides thoſe Two made uſe of *at that Time*. And now I will appeal to any Man of Senſe, whether I am not vindicated from the Charge of *Falſhood*

*ſhould* and *Partiality*, upon the Account of theſe Omiſſions. Let who will judge whether it be not intolerably *impertinent* and contrary to the Rules of Diſputation, for the Reſpondent in a Controverſy to be at every Turn thruſting in Arguments in Defence of his Poſition, inſtead of giving Replies to thoſe by which his Opponent is endeavouring to overthrow it. If it be, then theſe Arguments of *J. M.* were *impertinent*, and conſequently I was not obliged to take Notice of them in my Book. Beſides, it was impoſſible that I ſhould, ſeeing theſe Arguments were, as I before obſerved, upon the very firſt Propoſal of them rejected as impertinent, and by conſequence were never clearly and fully ſtated. In ſhort, to have taken Notice of all *J. M.*'s Arguments in order as he was pleaſed to offer them, would have been running every Thing into Confuſion: And this was what the Quakers would very fain have effected. They would have been contented, I ſuppoſe, that the Conference, and alſo the *Account* of it, ſhould have been like their *Tub-Diſcourſes*, without either *Head* or *Tail*; and then they might with a better Shew have triumphed as Conquerors, ſince it would then have been impoſſible for any one to have determined on which Side the Advantage lay.

And thus much for thoſe Omiſſions which I am charged with in the Five *Articles*: Beſides which, if you will believe the Title of the *Schedule*, and the Certificate at the End of it, there are many more of *J. M.*'s Arguments that are *totally omitted*. Now any one may reaſonably ſuppoſe, that if I had really omitted any more beſides theſe, which *J. M.* thought to be of any Conſequence, he would have mentioned them particularly, if not here with the reſt, at leaſt ſomewhere or other in his Book. But I have been juſt now ranſacking it up and down from End to End, and cannot find ſo much as one. So that I look upon this to be only a ſly Trick of *J. M.* and his Friends, to exaggerate the Matter, and to make People believe a great deal more of me than they found themſelves able to prove. But whether I have or have not omitted any more Arguments,

ments, 'tis not worth while to enquire. For if I have (which however I do not remember) I will ſtand by it that they were offered juſt after the ſame Manner that the other were, and conſequently the ſame Excuſe which will ſerve for my omitting thoſe, will alſo ſerve for my omitting theſe.

I have now, as I hope, ſufficiently clear'd my ſelf from that Branch of *J. M.*'s Charge, which relates to my having omitted ſeveral *of his Arguments againſt me*: The other Part of the Accuſation is, That I have alſo omitted, and not only ſo, but miſrepreſented ſeveral of *his Replies to my Arguments againſt him*. For ſpeaking of my Account he ſays, that (*a*) *the whole of it is ſo partial in giving* his *Replies, that ſome are totally omitted, others perverted, ſome curtail'd, others diſplaced*: (ſome Inſtances whereof he promiſes *to detect as they come in Courſe*), inſomuch that it ſeems (*b*) he *does not account himſelf anſwerable for what I and my* Amanuenſis *have ſo unfairly ſet down and called his*. This is a very heavy Charge, and it concerns me very highly to ſee it removed; in order whereto I muſt firſt of all take notice, that the Truth of all this ſtands entirely upon *J. M.*'s ſingle Authority. For it is to be obſerved that thoſe Five Quakers before-mentioned have not ſubſcribed to the whole Book, but only to the Five *Articles* contained in the *Schedule* at the End of it; and by Conſequence their Authority (if they had any) can extend no farther than to the Matters contained in theſe *Articles*. Well! what are theſe *Articles*? Why, the Title ſays, that they are *Some few of the Arguments and* ANSWERS *that are totally omitted*, &c. But do the *Articles* anſwer to this Title? Pray judge for your ſelf. The Firſt (which is very odd) is neither *Argument* nor *Anſwer*, but my own *Aſſertion*, before-mentioned. The other Four are likewiſe the very ſame

(*a*) Page 9.
(*b*) Page 21.

which

which you have already heard; that is to say, only some *Arguments* of *J. M.*'s against me. In short, there is not so much as one *Answer* either good or bad mentioned throughout the whole *Schedule*. How we are to account for this is somewhat difficult to determine. I can scarce think than these Men had any *Knavery* in their Heads, either in framing or subscribing to this *Title*; because if they had, they would in all Probability have coined some *Answer* or other, rather than have belied themselves in so gross a Manner as this is. What then must we suppose? Why, that *J. M.* and his Friends either did not understand what an *Argument* or an *Answer* means, or that they never considered what they drew up, or what they subscribed to! Dulness or Carelessness incredible! And yet this is the Man that pretends to dispute and write Books! These are they who would fain be thought Judges of what is material and pertinent in Matters of Controversy! But may all such be confined to *Stalls* and *Stables*, and not take upon themselves *to be Teachers* or Judges *of the Law*, who in the most common Matters do plainly shew, that they *understand neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm*. But to proceed. This latter Part of the Charge, I say, standing wholly upon *J. M.*'s Authority, I might for that Reason very justly pass it over, as not worthy any farther Notice; but I will not make use of this Advantage, seeing I can so easily prove it to be false from his own Book. In order whereto I shall lay down these Two Propositions, the Truth whereof I suppose no Body will dispute, *viz.* 1. That nothing ought to be look'd upon as a Misrepresentation or Perversion of any Man's Reply to an Argument, which doth not alter the Sense, or any way diminish the Force of that Reply. 2. That since the great Design of *J. M.*'s Book was to prove me guilty of Partiality; and accordingly he has in general Terms charged me, with omitting and perverting his Replies, and withal promised to detect me herein; I was bound, as well upon the Account of his own Credit, as in Point of Justice to me, to allledge some particular Instances, wherein I have either omitted his Re-

plies,

plies, or misrepresented them; from whence it naturally follows, that if *J. M.* has not any where produced such Instances, his Charge ought to be adjudged false and scandalous. I think this is putting the Matter upon as fair an Issue as *J. M.* can desire: And as for my Part I need not desire any Thing more; for let him, or who else will, undertake the Trial, and see if he can find any one single Instance of a Reply, which I am charged with having either *omitted*, *curtail'd*, or *displaced*, throughout the whole Book. *J. M.* has indeed instanced in Three Replies, which he says I have *perverted*, which the Reader may find, *p.* 16, 31, and 60. But they are such as, if he says true, (which however I do by no means grant) a Man who is not set upon wrangling, would have been ashamed to have insisted upon. For the *first* is a Reply, not to any of *my Arguments*, but to some Discourse which I had with him in the Yard before the Conference began, and by Consequence is nothing to the Purpose. The *second*, is an Answer to an Argument of mine, occasionally proposed to him at one of the Conferences, and set down in my *Account*, p. 25, 26. *viz.* That if the being endued with the ordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghost were being *baptized* with the Holy Ghost, it could not be true that the Baptism with the Holy Ghost did not commence till *Pentecost*; because those ordinary Gifts have been dispensed to good Men in all Ages. The Reply which I have set down as *J. M.*'s is this, *That good Men in all Ages were baptized with the Holy Ghost; but it was not called by that Name in those Days. Now by this*, says he, *the Partiality of his Relation is detected: For my Answer he remembers no more exactly than the Occasion of the said Objection, which was not in the Words recited by him.* Well; what Words was it in then? Why, you may go look; for *J. M.* does not think fit to inform you, but instead hereof tells me that he *will now favour me with an Answer, that I may not depend upon my treacherous Memory for my next Publication.* This was kindly done, I must confess; and since he is so good-natur'd I will venture to ask one *Favour* more,

more; which is, That *in his next Publication* he would be pleased to help *my Understanding* too, by shewing me how I am to make Sense of this Answer, for at present I am at a great Loss to know what he would have by it. Thus much I am certain of, that this Answer is nothing like that which he gave at the Conference, nor does *J. M.* pretend that it is the same; so that the Treachery which he has discovered, appears now very plainly not have been in my Memory, but in his own Designs; it being natural to suppose that if he had known of any considerable Variation that I had made in his Answer, he would have told us particularly what it was. The *third* and last Instance is, That whereas in Answer to one of my Arguments I have made *J. M.* to say, That Water Baptism was practised by the Apostles, *in Compliance to the Weakness of those Times*: The Word *Weakness* he says is my own. Now every one sees that whether this Word be put in or left out, the Reply of *J. M.* will be the very same. These are all the particular Instances wherein *J. M.* has so much as pretended that I have perverted his Replies; in every one of which you can't but observe that the Charge is most notoriously false; and as to the rest he has own'd them to be his Replies, by undertaking to defend them as such, without making the least Exception against so much as one of them. And indeed could *J. M.* have produced any Instance or Instances of Replies, either misrepresented or omitted by me, which would have born the Test, 'tis natural enough to think that he would have inserted them in his *Schedule*, as well as he did the Arguments. I am very sure that this is by far the most material Part of his Charge, and by Consequence what he should have been particularly careful to support by the joint Testimonies of himself and his Friends. But he knew very well that his Friends could not honestly attest to any such *Articles*; and therefore I suppose could not find in his Heart to put it upon them; I am willing, I say, to suppose that he was thus tender of the Honour and Consciences of his Friends; though to say the Truth it can hardly be supposed, consider-

ſidering how bold he has made with them upon other Occaſions. For I will venture to ſay, he might have charged me with any one Falſhood he had pleaſed, and they might have ſet their Hands to it, with as good a Grace as they have to ſome of thoſe *Articles* to which they have now ſubſcribed.

And now, I pray, is *J. M.* anſwerable for what I and my *Amanuenſis* have ſet down, or is he not? Certainly he is, unleſs he will plead the Privilege of Fools and Mad-men, which I ſuppoſe he would think himſelf ill uſed, if we ſhould ſay he has any Right to. And not without Reaſon; for here's Wiſdom in this very Contrivance, though *not that Wiſdom which is from above.* Theſe Anſwers you muſt know are not to be defended; and therefore it would be well if they could be diſowned. This they cannot be fairly neither - - - - But no Matter for that; 'tis neceſſary the contrary ſhould be believ'd; and therefore we will cry as loud as we can. Some tender-hearted Chriſtian or other will ſuppoſe that we are hurt; and when the Report once takes Wind we ſhall then be immediately ſurrounded with Multitudes, who will pity our Condition. It were to be wiſhed, that all Men had ſo much Sagacity as to know when they are palpably fool'd, and then there would not be much Danger to be apprehended from ſuch falſe Alarms as theſe. But this is not to be expected, eſpecially from thoſe with whom *J. M.* has principaly to do, who ſeem on the other Hand willing to be deceived into any Thing that does but flatter their Prejudices and falſe Opinions. Wherefore 'tis eaſy to gueſs what Influence they will receive from this Piece of Policy. O! the Prieſt's Book! Who minds that? Our Friend *J. M.* is wronged! Moſt grievouſly wronged! His Arguments are omitted! His Anſwers perverted! In ſhort, the whole Controverſy is repreſented unfairly on his Side! Thus they will cry: Nor does it ſignify whether all or any of this be true. *J. M.* ſays it is, and there's an End of the Buſineſs.

This

This seems to be the bottom of *J. M.*'s Contrivance; *viz.* To make his credulous and ignorant Followers believe him to be as wise a Man, and me as great a Knave, as they are disposed. But in sober Seriousness is it not a most melancholy Thing, to consider that Men should go about to support a Cause by such unjustifiable and scandalous Methods! That they should be so much wedded to their own Opinions as not to care how they blacken and defame those who shall be so charitable as to endeavour to convince them that they are mistaken! They may boast as much as they please; but I am sure were there no other Reason to be alledged, so wicked a Disposition of Mind as this, would be sufficient to prove them unworthy of the Name of Christians.

From what has been said, I think it is evident that *J. M.* and his attesting Friends, have fall'n so far short of proving my *Account* of the Conference partial, that they have fully justify'd my Proceedings. For it appears by what they themselves have objected against me, that there is no one Answer of *J. M.*'s to any of my Arguments either omitted, curtail'd, or displaced; nor any one of *J. M.*'s Arguments against me, which was so offered that it could be taken Notice of, which is not set down. And by Consequence that the whole Dispute is fairly and honestly represented. Thus am I acquitted even by Adversaries themselves, which I should have thank'd them for, had they intended me any such Piece of Justice; but as it is, I have only to thank God, whose good Providence has so ordered it, that my Innocency is vindicated by those very Measures which were taken to expose me to shame. And now I will leave any one to judge what Reason there was for those Complaints against me, which lye scattered up and down in *J. M.*'s Book; *viz.* That (*a*) my *Amanuenses's Minutes do not give a third Part of that Account*

(*a*) Page 9.

*which I my ſelf have given in my Book*; That my *Amanuenſis could not write* (b) *Short-Hand*; and therefore that *it was impoſſible that he ſhould do Juſtice, if he were inclin'd to have done it*: That although a little before the firſt Conference he deſired that (c) *ſuitable Preliminaries* might be fixed, *ſuch as* Amanuenſis, *and other Things*; yet I (d) *refuſed* this, and ſaid, that there was *no Occaſion for Preliminaries*, *no* Writer, *no* Præſes, *when I had ſkulkingly provided all before-hand*. What I ſay is all this to the Purpoſe? Is the Conference fairly repreſented, or is it not? It appears by your own Objections that it is. And why then all this ado? You have Juſtice done you; and what Matter is it how or by whom? I muſt however obſerve, that what *J. M.* ſays about the Propoſal, made by him before the firſt Conference, of providing an *Amanuenſis*, and my refuſing it, is (like what he ſays *of* my *Amanuenſis*; *viz.* That he was (e) *not of my own Flock*) an arrant Falſhood, as I can prove, ſo far as a Negative can be proved, by many Witneſſes. But his own Conſcience will tell him, that at that Time an *Amanuenſis* was not ſo much as mentioned. If it had it ſhould have been the firſt Thing I would have agreed to. Nor did I conceal my Intentions of making uſe of an *Amanuenſis*, with a Deſign to take any Advantage of him, (which I needed not in ſo good a Cauſe, and which I could not propoſe, ſeeing I was reſolved that Juſtice ſhould be done on both Sides), but leſt the propoſing ſuch a Thing before-hand, ſhould have put him upon Meaſures to evade the Diſpute, knowing how little the Quakers approve of Order and Regularity. But ſuppoſing it were as he ſays. He has no

(b) Page 21.
(c) Page 16.
(d) Page 19.
(e) Page 21.

Wrong

Wrong done him; and therefore no Reason to complain.—— But what shall we say? The Man is *plunged*; and (as is natural enough to those in Extremity,) catches hold of a *Hair* or a *Straw*, to keep himself from *Sinking*.

And thus I have, I hope, sufficiently vindicated my self (or rather the Quakers have themselves vindicated me) from the Charge of *Falshood* and *Partiality*; in doing which, as the Reader must observe, I have spent the greatest Part of this *Postscript*. And there was Reason for it; for this is by far the most material Point; the Answers of *J. M.* to my Arguments being so very silly, that were they not his, I should not think it worth my while to take any Notice of them, This being the Case, it will not, I suppose, be expected by any reasonable Person, that I should run over the whole Book Paragraph by Paragraph: And if *J. M.* expects it, I must assure him that I have not so much Time to bestow upon him. Wherefore I will make this fair Proposal: The main of the Conference with him consisted of *Three* Arguments in Favour of Water Baptism, deduced in Syllogistical Form. Now since *Three* Arguments are as good as Three Hundred, we will only consider whether *J. M.* has answered these Arguments or not. If he has, then I shall readily grant that I am worsted. If not, I think nothing more needs to be said, because then all his other Answers and Arguments must fall of Course.

To begin then. My first Argument turns upon this Question, *viz.* Whether the Baptism with the Holy Ghost is a perpetual Baptism or not. *J. M.* says it is; and that we may see whether he has proved it against me, it must be considered what I have supposed that to be which denominates a Person *Baptized with* the Holy Ghost. In the Minutes which were taken down at the Conference, and which stand at the end of my Account, there are several Passages which do demonstratively prove, that I have defined the Baptism with the Holy Ghost, to be *the Miraculous*

*Power*

*Power of ſpeaking unlearned Languages*; which Definition I muſt own is very imperfect. For hereby it ſeems as if I limited the Baptiſm with the Holy Ghoſt, *wholly* to the Gift of *Tongues*, and conſequently ſuppoſed that none but thoſe who had that particular Gift, could be in the Scripture Senſe of that Phraſe, ſtiled *Baptized with* the Holy Ghoſt. But this is what I never meant, as appears very evidently from what I ſaid at the Conference, p. 29, 30. where, though when ſpeaking of the Baptiſm with the Holy Ghoſt, with reſpect to the Apoſtles, I mentioned only the Gift of *Tongues*, as being the moſt remarkable Inſtance of that miraculous Power which was beſtowed upon them at *Pentecoſt*, when the Promiſe of the Father was fulfilled upon them, and indeed the only Gift which is particularly taken Notice of in that Place; yet that my Notion of the Baptiſm with the Holy Ghoſt, extended to the extraordinary Gift of the Holy Ghoſt *in general*; *i. e.* I ſuppoſed that *all* Perſons who *in thoſe Days* were endued with *any* of the extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, were upon that Account, and no other, ſaid to be *Baptized with* the Holy Ghoſt. Accordingly, on Purpoſe to prevent any Miſtakes upon this Matter, I did in drawing up my *Account*, put an *&c. catera* after *ſuch Languages as they had never learned*; I did alſo vary the wording of that Propoſition; inſtead of *the miraculous Power of ſpeaking unlearned Languages*, making it run *the miraculous Power of the Holy Ghoſt, ---- enabling them to ſpeak ſuch Languages*; which makes the *miraculous Power* of the Holy Ghoſt *in general*, to be the Baptiſm with the Holy Ghoſt, and the Gift of *Tongues* one particular Inſtance of that Power. This latter Alteration *J. M.* has taken Notice of *Page* 65. and hereupon charges me with *Sophiſtically turning the Force of my Syllogiſm another way*. If he will call this *Sophiſtry* I cannot help it, but I think 'tis a Liberty which all Men do and ought to take, when any Thing is incommodiouſly and obſcurely expreſſed in one Place, to vary the Phraſe in another, in order to make their Meaning underſtood.

stood. If I had done any more than this, *J. M.* might have blamed me; but since I have not, he would, if he had had the least Spark of Candor, or indeed common Justice in him, instead of complaining, have been satisfied by this, that I did not mean to limit the Notion of the Baptism with the Holy Ghost, to the particular Gift of *Tongues* only; and then all that Clamour about my *confounding the Efficient Cause and the Effect together, and making as many Baptisms as there are Effects of the Spirit*, which we meet with *Page* 25, 26. and *Page* 65. might have been spared. But he pretends that by this Variation I have made him to say that which he did not say. This indeed is something, though methinks he had better have kept it to himself. For what is it? I dare say you will hardly guess; but you shall hear, (*m*) *What I denied*, says he, *was---That Baptism with the Holy Ghost was* the miraculous Power of speaking unlearned Languages: *But by his varying the Phrase, he makes me to affirm, That Baptism with the Holy Ghost, is not that miraculous Power of the* HOLY GHOST; *which Charge I utterly deny.* Do you so Sir? Why then it seems, though you will not grant that the Baptism with the Holy Ghost, was the miraculous Power of speaking *unlearned Languages*; yet you will grant that it is the miraculous Power *of the Holy Ghost in general*, which is the very Thing I would have. But I will be more civil to *J. M.* than he has been to me, and not take his Opinion from this single Passage, but from his whole Book, in which he has sufficiently declared that he does not mean to limit the Baptism with the Holy Ghost, to the miraculous Power of the Holy Ghost only. At *Page* 42. he says, that *none can partake of the Graces of the Holy Ghost, but must be Baptized with the Holy Ghost.* And at *Page* 46, he *takes leave to tell me*, that *no Sanctifying Grace is without the*

(*m*) Page 66.

*Spirit's*

*Spirit's Baptiſm.* I muſt tell him, that ſuch a Liberty as this wanted ſome Apology, conſidering what he has elſewhere advanced. For he has granted, and does ſtill maintain, that the Baptiſm with the Holy Ghoſt, *did not begin till Pentecoſt.* Now whether his ſaying after this, that *there is no Sanctifying Grace without the Spirit's Baptiſm*, does not effectually exclude all the Prophets and Holy Men from the Beginning of the World till *Pentecoſt*, from *Sanctifying Grace*, I ſhall willingly leave to the Conſideration of his Friends. But this is only by the Way: That which I produced theſe Paſſages for, was to give the Reader a true State of the Queſtion between *J. M.* and me, which now appears plainly to be this, *viz.* That whereas he affirms, that whoever is endued with any Gifts of the Spirit *at all*, may in the Scripture Senſe of that Phraſe, be ſaid to be Baptized with the Holy Ghoſt: On the contrary I have affirmed, and uſed Arguments to prove, that the Promiſe of the Baptiſm with the Holy Ghoſt related only to thoſe *Miraculous* and *Extraordinary* Gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, which were to be poured out upon the Apoſtles, and ſome few others in the Primitive Times. How well *J. M.* has anſwered theſe Arguments in his Book, (which he ſcarce ſo much as attempted to do at the Conference) we are now to ſee.

The principal Argument I inſiſted upon for the Proof of my Aſſertion, is drawn from *Acts* 1. 4, 5. *Acts* 2. 1. 2, 3, 4. and *Verſes* 32, 33. of the ſame Chapter, compared together. Now upon theſe *J. M.* obſerves in the firſt Place, that *(p) We do not find that the Power of Speaking* unlearned Languages, *is called the Holy Ghoſt's Baptiſm*; which is to ſay juſt nothing at all. For I do not find that the Baptiſm with the Holy Ghoſt is either here or any where

(p) Page 25, 26.

elſe

else defined *expresly*, and *in terminis*, what it is; and therefore this can be no Argument either for or against any Notion of that Baptism whatsoever - - - But he proceeds: *Neither can any Inference be from thence fairly deduced that it is so meant or intended.* Well; How does he prove this? Why thus; *For the first of them relates what our Lord commanded them* (the Apostles) *to wait for*, viz. *The Promise of the Father*; and this it seems I cannot *prove to be the Power of speaking unlearned Languages* - - - -. The next *gives a Relation of the* Holy Ghost's *coming upon the Disciples in that eminent manner, wherewith being filled, they spake with Tongues as the Spirit gave them Utterance:* Now this, says he, rightly enough, was *only an Effect of the Spirit at that Time for peculiar Ends*; but then he denies the Consequence which he supposes I would draw from hence, *viz. that the speaking with Tongues was the Baptism with the Holy Ghost*; because he imagines that then *I must make so many Baptisms as there are Effects of the Spirit.* - - - - The *last* (says he) *gives an Account, that Christ having received the Promise of the Holy Ghost*, and then breaks of with an *&c cætera*, which must be thus supplied, *had shed forth that which they then saw and heard*, for these are the very Words of the Text. Now this he thinks *explains beyond all Contradiction, what the Promise of the Father was, which Christ commanded them to wait for*, viz. *The Holy Ghost,---or Spirit of Truth* ITSELF, *whatever Effect it might have, or Qualification it might give.*

This is the Substance of *J. M.*'s Answer; by which I think any one may see with half an Eye, that he is all this while running away with a wrong Hypothesis, *viz.* That I have confined the Notion of the Baptism with the Holy Ghost to the Gift of Tongues *only:* Whereas taking the Notion of that Baptism in the Latitude explained above, wherein I always understood it, his Objections will then not only vanish, but my Assertion may be established by those very Arguments by which he has endeavour'd to overthrow it.

For if in the *first* of the above-cited Places, we are taught that the Apoſtles were commanded not to depart from *Jeruſalem* till they had received the Promiſe of the Father, which Promiſe was, that they ſhould be Baptized with the Holy Ghoſt, then they were not as yet Baptized with it. If in the *Second* it is declared, that at the Day of *Pentecoſt, they were filled with the Holy Ghoſt, i. e.* as the || Phraſe imports, and the Circumſtances of the Place evidently ſhews, endued with ſome *extraordinary* or *uncommon Power* of the Holy Ghoſt, by which they ſpake with Tongues, and were enabled to do many other Miracles, we have then all the Reaſon to believe, that their being thus *filled with the Holy Ghoſt*, was that very Baptiſm, which our Saviour promiſed them; becauſe (as I have obſerved in my *Account*, Page 19.) this was the only remarkable Thing which happened to the Apoſtles between our Lord's Aſcenſion, and the Time of their Departure from *Jeruſalem*, which can with any manner of Colour be ſuppoſed to be that Baptiſm. But the *Third* and laſt Paſſage puts the Matter beyond Diſpute; for there St. *Peter* poſitively declares that this, *i. e.* this pouring forth of the Spirit upon the Apoſtles in that extraordinary Manner, was the Accompliſhment of our Saviour's Promiſe, that the Apoſtles ſhould be Baptized with the Holy Ghoſt; which it could not poſſibly be, unleſs it be ſuppoſed that this pouring forth of the Spirit was that very Baptiſm which was promiſed them. Here lies the Force of my Argument, which *J. M.* is ſo far from having anſwered, that he ſeems not to have

|| *That the Phraſe* πλησθῆναι ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ἁγίῳ *to be filled with the Holy Ghoſt, does in the Scripture Language imply a partaking of the Gifts of the Holy Ghoſt in an extraordinary Manner, the Reader may eaſily convince himſelf, by turning to theſe following Places,* viz. Acts 4. 8. —6. 3. —7. 55. —9. 17. —11. 24. —13. 9. Luke 1. 15. 41. 67. —4. 1.

under-

understood it. And therefore that he now may, I will reduce the whole into one plain *Syllogism*, which *J. M.* being such a perfect Master of *Logic*, will, I suppose, very readily apprehend, *viz.*

*That by which the Promise of the Father was accomplished, was the Baptism with the Holy Ghost. But,*

*The* extraordinary *and* miraculous Power *of the Holy Ghost bestowed upon the Apostles, and some others, after our Lord's Ascension, was that by which the Promise of the Father was accomplished.*

*Therefore that* extraordinary *and* miraculous Power, *was the Baptism with the Holy Ghost.*

The *Major* Proposition is evident and indisputable. The *Minor* is clear from the Words of St. *Peter* above-quoted, and from *Acts* 10. 44, 45, 46. where the same Apostle, speaking of the same *miraculous* and *extraordinary Power* of the Holy Ghost bestowed upon *Cornelius* and his Company, says, *Then remembred I the Word of the Lord, how that he said,* John *indeed Baptized with Water, but ye shall be Baptized with the Holy Ghost; i. e.* he looked upon this to be another Accompliſhment of our Saviour's Promise. Besides those Texts, there is one more, which does very much confirm what I am now advancing, and that is *Luke* 24. 49. *Tarry ye in the City of* Jerusalem *until ye be endued with Power from on High.* This was spoken by our Saviour to his Apostles; *and the Power from on High*, which they were here commanded to *tarry for*, is evidently the Baptism with the Holy Ghost, as appears by comparing this Verse with *Acts* 1. 4. Now that this *Power from on High*, was that *extraordinary* or *miraculous* Power of the Holy Ghost, by which they were qualified for the Apostolic Office, is so plain a Case, that it would be a Shame to go about to prove it.

And now I will leave the Reader to judge, whether *J. M.* has anſwered this Argument. For it appears *Firſt*, That it may be inferred from theſe Texts, by plain Conſequence, that the *Promiſe of the Father* was, though not the *miraculous Power of ſpeaking unlearned Languages*, excluſively of all other miraculous Gifts, yet, the *extraordinary and miraculous Power* of the Holy Ghoſt, by which the Apoſtles, and others, *were enabled* to ſpeak with Tongues, and do many other wonderful Works. It appears alſo, *Secondly*, That I do not *make ſo many diſtinct Baptiſms, as there are Effects of the Spirit.* For according to my Hypotheſis, all Perſons who were ſtiled Baptized with the Holy Ghoſt, were ſtiled ſo upon the ſame Account, *viz.* Becauſe they were endued with the *extraordinary Power* of the Holy Ghoſt, though indeed this extraordinary Power was not manifeſted in all Perſons the ſame way. In ſhort, according to my Notion, the Baptiſm with the Holy Ghoſt was not only *Specifically* but *Numerically ONE*, in (as I have explained my ſelf in my *Reply*, *Page* 72.) that great and plentiful Effuſion of the extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghoſt upon the Church, in the beginning of the Goſpel; and conſequently thoſe particular extraordinary Gifts enjoyed by ſeveral Perſons, and by virtue whereof they were in thoſe Days ſtiled *Baptized with* the Holy Ghoſt, do all of them jointly make up that one Baptiſm. As to what *J. M.* ſays in the *Third* Place, *viz.* That the Baptiſm with the Holy Ghoſt, was the giving *of the Holy Ghoſt*, or *Spirit of Truth ITSELF*, it is moſt abominably abſurd. For by the Spirit *itſelf* he means, or he means nothing, the *Perſon* of the Spirit. But how the Spirit can be received by mere Men, any otherwiſe than by his Gifts, *J. M.* is deſired at his Leiſure to explain. Beſides, if it could, the bare *receiving* of the Spirit cannot be what the Scriptures mean by being *Baptized* with the Spirit; for certainly it may be affirmed that the Spirit *itſelf* was given to the Prophets of Old, as truly as it can be affirmed, that it

is

is given to Christians now. And yet the Prophets could not be baptized with the Spirit, even according to *J. M.*'s Conception; for he grants, that the Spirit's Baptism did not begin till after our Lord's Ascension.

It may perhaps be objected, that tho' the Argument above set down does prove that the Apostles were baptized with the Holy Ghost, by their being endued with the extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghost; and consequently that the being endued with the extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghost was *one* Thing which did in those Days denominate any Person so baptized; yet it does not prove that this was the *only* Thing. To which I answer, that it does; unless some plain Instance can be produced from Scripture, where that Phrase is applied, or from whence it may be inferred by good Consequence, that it does belong to such as have been and are endued with the ordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghost *only*. For the Scripture being our only Rule in this Case, 'tis evident that we can determine no farther than we have Warrant from thence so to do. But if the Scripture does constantly apply the Phrase *baptized with the Holy Ghost*, to such Persons as were endued with the extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghost, and *to none else*; then 'tis plain, that it must be without any Warrant from Scripture, if we say that those who are endued only with the ordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghost, are baptized with the Holy Ghost. Now I do challenge the Quakers to shew me so much as one Text, by which it can be proved that the Phrase *baptized with the Holy Ghost* was ever applied, or ought (according to the Scripture Sense of it) to be applied to any such Persons as had or have only the Sanctifying Gifts or Graces of God's Spirit; *i. e.* the ordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghost. *J. M.* has indeed produced Three Places to this Purpose. But Two of them (which are *Act.* 2. 16, 17, 18. and *Verse* 39 of the same Chapter) I have already shewn to be insufficient in my *Reply*, page 75, 76. to which I refer my Reader. To the Third, I shall say a Word or two, because *J. M.* has made some Objections against the Exposition which

which I have given of it. The Place is 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. *For by one Spirit we are all baptized into one Body*, &c. This Text was alledged againſt me at the Conference; and accordingly the Reader will find my Thoughts about it, *Account*, page 28, *&c. ſeq.* which are theſe; *viz.* That the Apoſtle in this Place was ſpeaking only of *Spiritual* Perſons, *i. e.* of Perſons endued with the *extraordinary* Gifts of the Holy Ghoſt. That therefore when he ſays, *by one Spirit we are all baptized into one Body*; he does not mean that he and all thoſe of whom he was then ſpeaking, *i. e.* all thoſe *Spiritual Perſons* were ſo baptized. Now againſt this Interpretation *J. M.* has made ſeveral Exceptions. The Firſt is, *That this Epiſtle was wrote to the whole Church at* Corinth. Moſt certainly! But what then? Does it follow that every *Part* of this Epiſtle related to the whole Church at *Corinth*? Might not the Apoſtle give ſome Directions in this Epiſtle, which belonged only to ſome *particular* Perſons among them? Surely he might; and certainly he did (as will appear to any one who will but be at the pains to read over the whole Chapter) in this very Place; which being granted, there will, I think be Room enough not to extend the Signification of the word *all* any farther than to all thoſe particular Perſons; ſince, as every one knows, that Word not only may, but in many Caſes muſt, be thus limited. He objects farther, That whereas I expound the word πνευματικοὶ, Perſons endued with the *miraculous* and *extraordinary* Gifts of the Spirit, the true and plain Signification is *Spiritual Perſons* only; and hereupon he falls into great Wrath, and cries out, *O what abominable Perverſion of Holy Scripture is this!* And then wonders what my *Right Reverend* and *Spiritual Fathers in God, and my Reverend Spiritual Brethren the* Clergy will ſay to me; whom he thinks I have *ſent into* terra incognita, *by making Spiritual Perſons, and Perſons endued with the Miraculous and Extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit to be ſynonimous.* This Man I believe has frighted himſelf (as Wizards ſometimes do) out of his Wits, by the Force of his own Magick. For

it

it was but a Page or two before, that he had been breaking open the *Bottomless Pit*, and *conjuring* up a Legion of Devils about my Ears. But do but suffer thy self to cool a little, my Friend, and all will be well. That the Word πνευματικὸς must, if it be interpreted in a Latitude proportionable to the Signification of its Original πνεῦμα, be rendred a Spiritual Person *at large*, i. e. a Person who is endued with the Spirit, whether in an *ordinary* or *extraordinary* Way, I grant. But this Rule of Interpretation will not hold in all Cases; and particularly it will not hold here, where the Apostle has evidently used the Word with a *peculiar* Energy to denote such Spiritual Persons as were endued with the *extraordinary* Gift of the Spirit *only*. This, I say, is evident from the whole of the Apostle's Discourse, where those Gifts, upon the Account whereof these Persons are stiled πνευματικοὶ, are all of them *extraordinary* - - - But for the Signification of the Word πνευματικὸς, I must refer those, who desire farther Satisfaction, to the Learned Dr. *Hammond* in his *Annotations* upon the Place; and on *Luke* 9. 55. And for the Interpretation of the Text now in Dispute, to the Learned Dr. *Bennet*'s *Confutation of Quakerism*, *Chap.* 5. from *Page* 56. to *Page* 60. and *Chap.* 19 and 20 throughout, where I doubt not but every impartial Judge will find it established entirely to his Satisfaction.

And thus much for the *First* Argument. We will proceed now to the *Second*, drawn from *Mat.* 28. 19. *Go ye therefore*, &c. Now to prove, that this Text must be understood of Water Baptism, I alledged, 1*st*, That the Word βαπτίζω does *properly* and *literally* signifies to *Dip* or *Wash*. Which being granted me, I produced against him the Argument of *R. Barclay*, upon this very Place; That *there was no Necessity to go from the literal Sense of the Words, and that therefore we ought not to go from it.* To this Argument (which one would think is sufficient to stop the Mouth of any Quaker, who has but the least Grain of Modesty in him)

*J. M.*

*J. M.* (*a*) *answers* ad Hominem, *as before at the Conference - - - That Dipping does not always imply* Water, *but may be Blood, or any other Liquid* If *J. M.* had thought me to be *an Ass*, such an Answer would have done well enough. But certainly no Man who has the least Pretensions to common Sense can be put off with such egregious Trifling! The Word βαπτίζω signifies only to *dip*; now because a Thing may be dipp'd in *Blood*, or any Thing else, therefore *Water* is not always imply'd, when that is used. This *the Master of Arts is told of* very gravely; and lest he should doubt it, he *very quickly proves it* upon him, from *Rev.* 19. 13. where we have ἱμάτιον βεβαμμένον αἵματι, which he very nicely translates *his Vesture was dipped in Blood*; and from *Isaac Causabon*, who, it seems, tells us, that *baptizare* is *mergere ad tingendum*, from the *Radix* βάπτω *tingo*. But tell us News, Sir, I beseech you! The *Master of Arts* knew all this before; but then he did not, nor does he yet know how these learned Criticisms of yours will serve to help you out of the Dirt; the Question being not what the Word βαπτίζω does *sometimes* signify, but what it must signify *in this Place*. This Text you say must be understood *literally*; you likewise grant that to *baptize* literally signifies to *dip in some Liquid*; consequently you must grant, that our Saviour commanded his Disciples to go and baptize all Nations *in some Liquid*. The Matter therefore only is what that Liquid is which our Saviour commanded his Disciples to baptize with. Now if thou wilt persist in it, that this Liquid could be *Blood*, or any Thing else besides *Water*; for ought I know a little *Hellebore*, and a Dark Room, will bring thee to a Sense of thy Extravagancy much sooner than disputing with thee. After all, it seems *J. M.* does not himself lay any Stress upon this Answer; for he says that *it was not intended as an Answer to the Argument, but only to my noisy Clamour*. Now for my Part, I did not know before, that *noisy Clamour* was capable of be-

(*a*) Page 47, 48.

ing

ing *answered* any otherwise than by *noisy Clamour*, in which respect it must be acknowledged that *J. M.* had much the better of me: But if his Design was to *silence* my *noisy Clamour*, I must needs say, he took a very wise Course; for I know of nothing that is more likely to make a Man hold his Tongue, than for his Adversary to give such Answers as plainly shew that he has lost his Reason, and is not fit to be talk'd with. However, we have *J. M.*'s own Concession, that this is no Answer to my Argument. Well; what then, does he give as an Answer? Why, you have it in these Words: *I do not find but the Text literally expresseth its own Meaning in such significant Words, as to the mary Reader is more intelligible, than any Thing that can be added or implied would render it.* Truly, nor I neither. The Text is so very clear, that were it not for such as *J. M.* it would be a Shame to go about to make it clearer. But what is this *Meaning*, which the Text *literally* understood doth so *significantly express*? Is it that the Apostles were commanded to baptize with Water? No, have a Care of that; for it seems there is still *no urgent Necessity of such an Addition or Implication of Water*. That is to say; notwithstanding *J. M.* has granted, that this Text must be understood *literally*; notwithstanding *to baptize* literally signifies to *wash* or *dip* in *some Liquor*, as he has also granted; notwithstanding therefore it must be supposed, that our Saviour did command his Apostles to make Disciples by Washing them in some Liquor; and notwithstanding it is impossible to suppose that he could command his Apostles to dip or wash Men in any *other* Liquor but *Water*; notwithstanding all these Things, which prove beyond Contradiction that Water must be understood; yet there is no Necessity that it should be understood! The plain *English* of which is, That notwithstanding *J. M.* is fairly confuted from his own Confessions, yet he is resolved to set a good Face upon the Matter, and say, that he is not confuted. After this he leads us a long Wild-Goose Chase, about the Signification of the Phrase εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, *in the Name*; the Design of which is to prove, after his Way of proving, that the Apostles were here commanded to go and baptize

tize all Nations *with the Holy Ghoſt*. But this is only unſaying all that he has ſaid before about the *literal* Meaning of the Word *Baptize*. For if this Text is to be underſtood *literally*, as he ſays it is, then the Apoſtles could not be commanded to go and baptize all Nations *with the Holy Ghoſt*; becauſe the Baptiſm with the Holy Ghoſt is not a *literal* but a *figurative* Baptiſm, as I have (*a*) elſewhere obſerved.

The other Argument by which I endeavoured to prove that this Text muſt neceſſarily be underſtood of Water Baptiſm, ſtands upon this Queſtion; *viz.* Whether the Baptiſm *in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt*, which the Apoſtles were here commanded to adminiſter, was the ſame with the Baptiſm *in the Name of the Lord Jeſus*, which is elſewhere ſpoken of in Scripture. *J. M.* granted that it was; and from that Conceſſion I argued, that then the Baptiſm *in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt*, muſt be *Water Baptiſm*. Becauſe Baptiſm *in the Name of the Lord Jeſus* was *Water Baptiſm*; as I proved plainly from *Act.* 10. 47, 48. To this Argument *J. M.* at the Conference would give no direct Anſwer. But to make amends for this Defect, he anſwers in his Book —— What? Why truly I cannot very well tell: For he runs on for near a whole Page together in ſuch a Strain, that I think I may challenge the moſt cunning Man upon Earth to find out his Meaning. We may in part gueſs what 'tis he drives at by the following Syllogiſm, to which he has pretended to reduce his whole Reply, *viz.*

*If the Form of Words, viz.* In the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, *with Water Baptiſm, was only intended in the ſaid Commiſſion*, Mat. 28. *then the Apoſtles, without all doubt, would have uſed the ſame, being otherwiſe diſobedient.*

*But the Apoſtles did not uſe the ſame Form of Words, but only the Name of the Lord Jeſus, as appears* Act. 10. 47, 48.

(*a*) *Reply to* G. G. Page 51. *There*

*Therefore not meant nor intended in the said Commission.*

Now by this any one may perceive that *J. M.* is all this while groping in the Dark, after he knows not what. For the Difficulty which he had to remove is this; *viz.* How it can be denied that the Baptism which the Apostles were here commanded to administer, and which is signified by the Phrase of baptizing *in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, was Water Baptism; when the Baptism which is expressed by the Phrase of *baptizing in the Name of the Lord Jesus*, which *J. M.* grants is the *very same* Baptism, is Water Baptism? This I say is the Question; instead of answering which, *J. M.* falls clearly upon another Matter, and comes and tells us that our Saviour never intended in this Commission to oblige his Disciples in Baptizing to use *that very Form of Words*, viz. *I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* I will be bold to say that this is more than *J. M.* has proved or can prove; but suppose it were true, what is this to my Argument? I hope though our Saviour did not intend to oblige his Apostles to use that *Form*, yet he intended to oblige them to administer that Baptism, which was meant or signified by that Form. Which if it be allowed to be Water Baptism, the Dispute is ended; if not, *J. M.* will still be as much at a loss as ever, how to reconcile his denying it to be Water Baptism, with his asserting, that it is *the same* with that Baptism, which is signified by the Phrase of baptizing *in the Name of the Lord Jesus*, and which evidently is Water Baptism. But since *J. M.* is so fully bent not to listen to any Reason, it was his wisest Course to endeavour to evade the force of the Argument by this Stratagem; for the Difficulty in Truth is such, that it is not capable of being removed, it standing wholly upon this self-evident Principle, *viz.* That *where two Things are the same, that which is proved of the one, is also proved of the other.* Now if *J. M.* can be so hardy as to dispute this, I suppose no one will then be at a loss what to think of him. I shall observe one Thing more *ex abundanti* upon this Argument, which is, (that

we may from hence, in a very few Words, overthrow all that *J. M.* has built upon that Conceit of his, *viz.* That to baptize *in the Name*, ſignifies to baptize *into the Power of Jeſus*, or *of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt*. For the Uſe that he would make of that Interpretation is this, that (*t*) *Water Baptiſm doth not baptize its Subjects into the Name*, i. e. *Power of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt*; and by Conſequence that to baptize *in the Name*, &c. is to baptize *with the Holy Ghoſt*. I ſhall not ſtay to enquire preciſely what he means by baptizing *into the Power*, &c. for let him mean what he will, his Argument muſt come to nothing. For *J. M.* grants (and indeed that Man's Face muſt be made of Braſs who can deny it) that the Baptiſm wherewith St. *Peter* commanded *Cornelius* to be baptized, *Act.* 10. 47, 48. was Water Baptiſm; and the adminiſtring this Baptiſm is expreſsly called baptizing *in the Name of the Lord*; as alſo it is called *Act.* 8. 16. and *Chap.* 19. 5, 6. Now if thoſe who were baptized with Water, were thereby baptized *in the Name of the Lord*, then *J. M.*'s Aſſertion that *Water Baptiſm doth not Baptize its Subjects into the Name*, &c. muſt be falſe. This is ſo clear a Caſe, that I was perfectly aſtoniſhed to hear *J. M.* after he had granted that the Baptiſm wherewith St. *Peter* Baptized *Cornelius in the Name of the Lord*, was Water Baptiſm, ſaying immediately, and as it were in the ſame Breath, that (*u*) he *had ſufficiently proved before, that Baptiſm in the Name, as it ſignifies the Power of the Lord Jeſus, is the Holy Ghoſt's Baptiſm.* What does he mean by putting in theſe Words, *as it ſignifies the Power?* He contends that to Baptize *in the Name*, ſignifies to Baptize *into the Power*, and nothing elſe; and 'tis upon this ſingle Baſis that his whole Argument ſtands. Wherefore according to him, to Baptize *in the Name*, does always ſignify to Baptize *with the Holy Ghoſt*. But unleſs he were reſolved to maintain his Principles at any Rate, ſurely ſo plain an Inſtance as this to the contrary, ſhould

(*t*) Page 50.
(*u*) Page 51.

have

ave convinced him of his Miſtake, and taught him,
hat all he had ſaid before, though it were a Thouſand
mes better than it is, was to ſtand for nothing.

And thus I think I have ſhown the Inſufficiency of
*M.*'s Anſwers to the main of thoſe Arguments which
ere urged againſt him at the Conference. Were the
poſing my Adverſary the Thing I had in View, there
ould be Encouragement enough for me to canvaſs the
maining part of his Book as particularly as I have
is, where I could ſhow almoſt in every Page, ſuch
ſtances of Ignorance, Malice, and Impertinence, as
uld raiſe the Pity and Indignation of every Sober and
genuous Perſon. But the Reader will eaſily ſuppoſe
this, conſidering who it is I have to deal with; and
ce my Deſign is not againſt the Man, but againſt
s Cauſe, which I hope I have ſufficiently overthrown
what I have already done, I choſe rather to let the
t of my Book to ſhift for it ſelf, than to put my ſelf,
d thoſe who may think it worth their while to per-
theſe Papers to any further Trouble. Beſides, there
nother Reaſon, which had I any Inclination to it,
uld mightily diſcourage me from proſecuting the
ſpute any longer againſt *J. M.* and that is, That
ugh I ſhould be ſo lucky as to make even the Qua-
ſenſible that he is confuted, I can't be ſatisfied that
the more for that they would believe themſelves
e ſo. For *J. M.* has given us no reaſon to believe,
his Performance has paſſed the Approbation of the
thren, much leſs that they will put the Iſſue of their
ſe upon his Defence of it. 'Tis true, he has mu-
d up Five at the End of his Book, who are, as I
before, all Quakers: But their Characters are ſuch
- - - I forbear to mention, to ſhow *J. M.* that I am
diſpoſed to take that Advantage which I very juſtly
t, in making the World the Judge of the Credit
hoſe who have publickly impeached mine. Me-
ks it would have been a greater Recommendation
*J. M.*'s Performance, if inſtead of ſuch as theſe, he
got the Names of *G. G. E. D.* or ſome other of the
ncipal and Leading Men of the Party: But, as I am
rmed, theſe Perſons have no Opinion of *J. M.*

They

They found themſelves ſtrangely deceived in their Man, and went away diſſatisfied at his Proceedings. And I am the more forward to believe this, from their foreſtalling him in the Vindication which they have publiſhed in *G. G.*'s Name, a Thing which I conceive they would hardly have done, had they been ſo well ſatisfied of his Abilities, and Proficiency in their School, as to believe they might ſafely rely upon him. Some of them, it ſeems, were heard to ſay, that *J. M.* talk'd *too much Reaſon*, for which Offence I hope they will think he has now made them Amends. But that which gave the greateſt Diſguſt, was his granting to me *that the Baptiſm with the Holy Ghoſt did not begin till Pentecoſt.* This was giving up the Cauſe all at once, which *G. G.* ſaw, complain'd of it *as an Impoſition which I did put upon* J. M. and as he ſays, *earneſtly offer'd to confute it.* And to ſay the Truth, *J. M.* did in that Point very much betray his Ignorance of the Principles of his Sect; for though 'tis *Truth* that the Baptiſm with the Holy Ghoſt did not begin till *Pentecoſt*, I am pretty ſure 'tis not *Quakeriſm.* For the Quakers, ſo many of them as I have Read or Diſcourſed, except *J. M.* ſtand to it ſtoutly with *G. G.* that *it ever was*; and it concerns them very much, that this Aſſertion be found true, for if it be falſe, I can tell them there will be no contending againſt Water Baptiſm. Wherefore the Quakers had reaſon enough to be aſhamed of their far-fetched Champion, when they ſaw him falling faſt by his own Weapons; and by this Time perhaps he may have reaſon to be aſhamed of himſelf. If he be not, I do aſſure him I am weary of him; not becauſe I have no more to ſay, but becauſe I think it would be to no Purpoſe to ſay any more. Had I to do with a Man truly Conſcientious, I ſhould not grudge any Pains that I am able to beſtow. Such a one would ſet aſide all private Conſiderations, when they come to ſtand in Competition with the Truth, and by Conſequence would never ſtand out any longer than he was of a reaſonable Satisfaction. But I muſt inform *J. M.* if he does not know it already, that this is mere

his Character, and I think his Book plainly enough shows that he does not deserve it. The manner wherein he has used me is such, as an honest Man would have been ashamed of; and the poor Shifts he has made use of, to avoid the Force of the plainest Arguments, are beneath that Sense which I know him to be Master of, and do therefore evidently show, that he is resolved not to be, or at least not to own himself to be, convinced, how strongly soever he is confuted. Now to such as these I neither am, nor shall hereafter be at Leisure: And therefore all that I have to say to him farther is, That for the Injustice he has done me I forgive him; and hope that he may render himself worthy of Forgiveness at God's Hands for the Injury he has done to his Truth; and with this I bid *J. M.* and his Friends heartily to farewel.

---

# *POSTSCRIPT.*

THE Reader is desired to take Notice, that since these Papers were finished, I have had several Opportunities of Discoursing with one of the most considerable of those Quakers, who have attested to the Certificate at the End of *J. M.*'s Book. Upon my first talking with him, I perceived plainly that he knew not any Thing particularly of what he had Subscribed to; which I thought might be the Fault of his Memory: But I was strangely deceived. For it was not many Days after that I made it my Business to go to his House, where having produced my Account, and *J. M.*'s Answer to it, I desired him to read over the Articles to which he had Subscribed, and convinced him presently, that several of those Articles charged me with having omitted such Things as I had indeed set down. Hereupon asking him, *How he dared to set his Hand to such Falsehoods*: He replied very frankly, that *To the best of his Remembrance, he never read the Articles over before he Signed them.* The same Words he again repeated

peated to me Two or Three Days after, alledging for his Excuſe, the *Hurry he was in when the Paper was brought to him.* This Anſwer was really aſtoniſhing; and I profeſs I can ſcarce think of it now without Horror. For I plainly perceive that 'twas owing more to my good Fortune, than to the Care (I had like to have ſaid Honeſty) of this Man, that he did not bear Witneſs againſt me, for *Treaſon, Murder, Theft*, or any ſuch like Crimes; which had certainly been the Caſe, if thoſe who drew up theſe Articles, had been malicious enough to have given him the Opportunity. I ſhall leave the Reader to make ſuch Uſe of this Story as he thinks fit; in the mean Time I ſhall obſerve, by way of Caution to this *Friend* of mine, that if he does not for the future take more Care how he gives his Hand, his Neighbours will have reaſon to be ſhy of him. I do not think fit to acquaint my Reader who this Perſon is, not only becauſe it would ſignify nothing to any but thoſe who know him, but chiefly becauſe, though in Juſtice I might, yet the Thing is ſo very ſcandalous, that in Charity I think I ought not to mention his Name in ſo publick a manner. If there be any Perſon who queſtions my Integrity, let him come to me, and I will for my own Vindication, ſhow him the Man; I believe, or hope at leaſt, that he will not eat his Words; but if he ſhould, I have Witneſs at Hand, ſufficient to fetch them up again.

*FINIS.*

---

## ERRATA.

PAg. 5. lin. 14. r. *and his Amanuenſis.* pag. 19. lin. 21. r. *curtail'd, perverted, or diſplaced.* Ibid. l. 26. r. *by my Adverſaries.* p. 21. l. 38. & 39. theſe Words, *there are ſeveral Paſſages which do demonſtratively prove that*, are to be left out, and inſerted in the following page, l. 9. immediately before theſe Words, *though when ſpeaking of the Baptiſm*, &c. p. 28. l. 20. r. *numerically one, viz.* p. 29. l. 3. for *Conception* r. *Conceſſion.* p. 30. l. 10. immediately after theſe Words, *he does not mean that he and all*, inſert *Chriſtians in general were baptized with the Holy Ghoſt, but that*

B 10 92 MUSEUM